



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,477	01/29/2001	Antonius Hendricus Maria Holtslag	NL 000025 US	1648
24737	7590	05/21/2003		
PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN CORP 580 WHITE PLAINS RD TARRYTOWN, NY 10591				
			EXAMINER	
			NELSON, ALECIA DIANE	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2675		C		
DATE MAILED: 05/21/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/772,477	HOLTSLAG ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Alecia D. Nelson	2675	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2001 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because Figures 2 and 4-7 contain multiple diagrams in the figures that are not labeled (i.e., figure 2 should be composed of Fig. 2a and 2b). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claim 2** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 2, recites that the common luminance value data for the least significant subfield is obtained by averaging the corresponding least significant subfield original luminance value data of the set of lines, however this is not described in the specification. The specification makes little mention of how the usage of the average luminance value is an improvement as compared with the prior art (page 4, third full paragraph), and states that the value displayed *may* be the average value of

the original individual values (page 2, last full paragraph). However, there is no mention of how the common luminance value is generated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. ***Claims 1, 3, 5, and 8*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wani (EP 0 890 941) in view of Kida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,329).

With reference to ***claims 1 and 8***, Wani teaches a method and apparatus comprising a subfield driven display device for displaying successive image frames/fields on display lines, wherein the image frames/field have an original luminance value data being coded in subfields comprising a group of most significant

subfields and a group of less significant subfields (see column 3, line 44-column 5, line 55), characterized in that the display apparatus comprises means for selecting different sets of adjacent lines for successive frames/fields, different regions of the display device, and/or different subfields (see column 6, lines 14-51).

Wani fails to teach that the display apparatus comprises means for supplying a common luminance value data to the lines of a set of the set of lines.

Kida et al. teaches a driving system for a plasma display wherein the control means is provided for controlling the driving means so as to drive neighboring two rows as one unit of scanning by line sequential scanning when the first discrimination signal represents the moving picture signal, and for shifting the rows scanned at the same time by one row electrode in a first field and a second field (see column 2, lines 35-40). It is also taught that the driver (26) produces a pixel data pulse having voltage corresponding to the logic value of each bit of the pixel data corresponding to the sub-frame (see column 5, lines 51-54).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for the device of Wani to supply a common luminance value data to the lines in the group of lines, as taught by Kida et al., in order to provide a display system with reduced addressing time thereby increasing display brightness without abrupt intensity changes in the image.

With reference to **claim 3**, Wani teaches that the sets of lines comprise sets of two lines (see column 6, lines 32-35).

With reference to **claim 5**, Wani teaches that the sets of lines are shifted by one, or more, lines in successive frames (see column 6, lines 36-39).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wani in view of Kadi et al. as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Huang (U.S. Pub No. 20010045924).

With reference to **claim 4**, Wani and Kadi et al. fail to teach that the set of lines comprises three lines.

Huang teaches a driving method and apparatus for a PDP device wherein the scanning lines are divided into three or more groups

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow two or more scanning lines to be included in each group, as taught by Huang to that which is taught by Wani and Kadi et al. in order to further reduce the effective multiplex ratio to thereby increase the selection ratio, which improves the display quality.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wani in view of Kadi et al. as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Nagai (U.S. Patent No. 6,448,947).

With reference to **claim 6** Wani and Kadi et al. fails to specifically teach that the display device comprises a first region being the upper half and a second region being the lower half.

Nagai teaches a method and apparatus for driving a plasma display panel wherein the display is comprised of a first upper region and a second lower region (see figure 12).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow a device similar to that which is taught by Wani and Kadi et al. to have the ability to drive an upper and lower region as taught by Nagai in order to provide a plasma display panel with reduced addressing time and a higher quality of brightness due to the extended sustain periods and driving the panel in upper and lower regions, thereby improving the overall display quality.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wani in view of Kadi et al. as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Prince et al. (U.S. Patent No. (5,508,716).

With reference to **claim 7**, Wani and Kadi et al. fail to specifically teach that the display device wherein the grouping of lines for each successive frame or field and for different regions of the display device is performed in a random manner.

Prince et al. teaches grouping the row electrodes into pairs to reduce the multiplex ratio of the display. It is also taught that in other embodiments wherein the number of electrodes forming each group and the algorithm for changing the groupings of row electrodes in subsequent addressing cycles can be varied (see column 5, lines 20-24).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the device similar to that which is taught by Wani and Kadi et al. to have the ability to change the grouping arrangement as taught by Prince et al. in order to reduce the effective multiplex ratio to thereby increase the selection ratio, which improves the display quality.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alecia D. Nelson whose telephone number is (703)305-0143. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras can be reached on (703)305-9720. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314 for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9700.



STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

adn/ADN
May 13, 2003